

IN THE DRAWINGS

One replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 6 is submitted herewith to correct a minor error in which box 204's legend "Basic Info. Display Unit" is changed to "Additional Info. Display Unit," since box 203's legend is "Basic Info. Display Unit." Support for the change to FIG. 6 can be found, for example, on page 20, lines 13-15. Approval and entry of the corrected replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 6 is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Handel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,651).

According to the foregoing, the claims are amended, and, thus claims 1-25 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added. The rejections are hereby traversed.

DRAWINGS

According to the foregoing, one replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 6 is submitted herewith to correct a minor error in which box 204's legend "Basic Info. Display Unit" is changed to "Additional Info. Display Unit," since box 203's legend is "Basic Info. Display Unit." Support for the change to FIG. 6 can be found, for example, on page 20, lines 13-15. Approval and entry of the corrected replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 6 is respectfully requested.

35 USC 102 REJECTION

The independent claims are 1, 2, 22, 23 and 25.

Amended independent claims, using claim 1 as an example, provide "storing, in an additional information database, ***additional information for individual product information and additional information user profile related display parameters set by an information provider to display the additional information for the user***, in association with individual product information of a product information database" and "***selecting ... additional information, based upon comparing that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a with the stored additional information user profile related display parameters set by the***

information provider." For example, the present application FIG. 4, page 11, lines 7-9 and page 14, lines 21-25 and page 18, lines 7-21 and page 19, lines 10-15 ("user profile related display parameters"); and page 14, lines 12-14 and page 26, lines 9-18 and additional information database 3, 102 in FIGS. 1, 2 and 4, managed by the product information management server 100 as "*an information provider*"; and page 23, lines 12-23 ("**comparing** ..." and "**additional information user profile related display parameters set by the information provider**," support the claim amendments. For example, in the present Application FIGS. 1 and 2 and descriptions thereof, for example, in page 18, lines 11-16 ("recommendation parameter ... have been set beforehand") and page 15, lines 9-21, expressly discuss the claimed "**additional information user profile related display parameters**" 3, 102, and the claimed "**profile information of the user**" 4, 201. The product information management server 100 manages the additional information by setting the claimed "**additional information user profile related display parameters**" 3, 102, which differs from "**acquired user profile information**" set by the user. Hence, the claimed "**additional information for individual product information and additional information user profile related display parameters set by an information provider to display the additional information for athe user**," does not correspond to Handel's customer profile database 1060, which is set by the customer, but not by the integrators' web server 1020.

The Office Action Response to Arguments page 7, lines 1-7 alleges Handel's FIG. 10A content database 1040 and supplier and customer profile databases (1060 and 1050), respectively, can anticipate the claimed additional information and display parameters for the additional information. However, Handel's customer profile database 1060 is set by the customer, which cannot anticipate the claimed embodiment by failing to disclose, either expressly or inherently (necessarily including), the claimed "**additional information user profile related display parameters set by an information provider to display the additional information for athe user**." In other words, Handel is silent on the integrator's web server 1020 setting the customer profile database 1060. Handel column 30 lines 47-52 expressly discusses "The Customer Profile Database 1060 contains personal information about the customers ...," which differs from the claimed "**additional information user profile related display parameters set by an information provider**," because an information provider does not set Handel's Customer Profile Database 1060.

Further, Handel column 30, lines 42-47 discusses supplier profile database 1050 contains "information about the product and service providers integrated into the intention," which cannot anticipate the claimed embodiment by failing to disclose, either expressly or inherently (necessarily including), the claimed "**additional information user profile related display parameters set by an information provider to display the additional information for a the user.**" In other words, Handel's supplier profile database 1050 does not include the claimed "**user profile related display parameters set by an information provider,**" because Handel only discusses information about the product and service providers.

Further, Handel's integrator's web server fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "**selecting ... additional information, based upon comparing that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a with the stored additional information user profile related display parameters set by the information provider,**" because Handel's customer and supplier profile databases 1060, 1050 and content database 1040 do not include any "**additional information user profile related display parameters set by the information provider.**"

A benefit of the claimed embodiment is that while in Handel, a filtering condition is described in the user profile so that the user specifies a filtering condition by setting his/her profile, in the claimed embodiment those who provide information to the user can set a filtering condition, hence, the claim language "storing, in an additional information database, **additional information for individual product information and additional information display parameters set by an information provider to display the additional information for a the user,** in association with individual product information of a product information database" and "**selecting ... additional information, based upon comparing that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a with the stored additional information user profile related display parameter of the additional information parameters set by the information provider.**" The "**stored additional information user profile related display parameters set by the information provider**" is compared with "**a user profile**" to select "**additional information**." Thus, a difference between the claimed embodiment and Handel is that "**additional information user profile related display parameters**" are related to user profiles, but not set by the users, rather set by those who provide the additional information.

In view of the foregoing remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 25

Independent claim 25 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second, paragraphs. According to the foregoing, amended claim 25 provides "storing in an additional information database, and in association with the individual product information of the product information database, ~~dynamically changing additional individual product information for the individual product information and additional information user profile related display parameters modifiable by an information provider~~ for displaying the dynamically changing additional information at the user terminal" and "~~selecting dynamically changeable, by the information provider, additional individual product information by referring to the additional information database, based upon the acquired user profile and the, a stored additional information user profile related display parameter of the additional information parameters modifiable by the information provider~~."

For example, the present Application page 26, lines 9-18 and FIG. 4 provide a written description of the claimed "*storing in an additional information database ... additional individual product information for the individual product information and additional information user profile related display parameters modifiable by an information provider*," by discussing "The manager of an online shopping site, by referring to the profile information of a user that has actually made a purchase and modifying the additional information database 102, can, without updating the product information database 101, update valuable information, such as recommendation information, that will assist a user in selecting products to purchase." In other words, "*additional information user profile related display parameters modifiable by an information provider*" achieves the claimed "*selecting dynamically changeable, by the information provider, additional individual product information by referring to the additional information database*, from the additional information database, additional information that meets, ~~based upon the acquired user profile and the, a stored additional information user profile related display parameter of the additional information parameters modifiable by the information provider~~," providing a benefit that with respect to acquiring same user profile from a user, when the information provider changes a

user-profile-related-display parameter, the additional information changes for the same acquired user profile.

Further, the claims are definite by complying with 35 USC 112, second paragraph, by particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming "***storing in an additional information database ... additional individual product information for the individual product information and additional information user profile related display parameters modifiable by an information provider***" and "***selecting dynamically changeable, by the information provider, additional individual product information by referring to the additional information database, based upon the acquired user profile and the, a stored additional information user profile related display parameter of the additional information parameters modifiable by the information provider***," which is clear to one skilled in the art. Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing over Handel due to their dependencies from the independent claims. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 9, 2007 By: 
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501



**Attachment To The Amendment
Serial No. 09/809,110
Attorney Docket No. 1405.1038
Due: March 21, 2007**